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ABSTRACT

Despite the undisputable role of education as a prerequisite for development, the importance of ECDE has not been fully appreciated in Kenya. A large proportion of pupils who enrol in Pre-primary school do not complete the eight-year cycle within the prescribed minimum period and a significant number do not complete the cycle at all resulting to high wastage in Kericho County. The main objective of this study was to determine parents’ socio-economic factors influence on enrollment and retention of pre-primary school pupils in Bureti sub-county, Kericho County. The study focused on socio-economic factors including parent’s level of income, occupation and size of the family as independent variables. Dependent variable was enrolment and retention. The study also established the influence of parents’ educational background on enrollment and retention of pre-primary school pupils. This study used the production function theory by Becker's (1993) to examine the relationship between independent and dependent variables. Descriptive survey design was used in this study to explore the trends in enrolment and retention of children in public pre-schools. The study targeted a population of 214 comprising of all the ECDE teachers of the public pre-schools in Bureti sub-county. The researcher made use of a questionnaire to collect data from the ECDE teachers. Quantitative data was tabulated and analyzed by descriptive statistics including frequency and percentages presented through tables and figures to show sample characteristics and major patterns emerging from the data. Qualitative data was analyzed through descriptive statements and the results were presented in charts and graphs from which generalization and conclusions were made. Results revealed that parents’ education, Size of the family, parent’s occupation and level of income re among the specific parents’ socio-economic characteristics that affects children enrolment and retention. There is a very strong positive correlation between parental level of education and pre-school children enrolment and retention. The results also show that there was a very strong positive correlation between parental income and child drop out. Also, there is a strong positive correlation between family size and child drop out. From the results the study concluded that the level of education can determine enrollment and retention among pre-school children as indicated by the strong positive correlation between variables. Again children from Bureti sub-county dropped out of school especially those from big families due to inadequate resources for the large number of children in school. Recommendations of the study were made that the parents be made aware of the importance of child education through compulsory education meetings in school. Teachers also should always engage the parents of the pupils to ensure the pupils get the basic needs. Teachers should be keen to know all their pupils and understand their back grounds.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXTUALIZATION OF THE STUDY

1.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the background of the study, statement of the problem, the aims and objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations and delimitations of the study, assumptions of the study, and the operational definitions of terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

Education being the key to social and economic growth, the government of Kenya has endeavored to promote the expansion of education in public secondary schools (Kabuku, 2012). Enrolment of children in Early Childhood Development and Education Centers is a greater step towards achieving education for all. In this regard, low pre-school enrolment and poor class retention have far-reaching consequences on achieving education for all thus, it’s important to be clear about the factors associated with this.

Globally, most of the developed countries have pre-primary enrolment rates exceeding 90%. For example, United Kingdom alongside Germany, France, Norway, Denmark and Sweden are leading in pre-school enrolment of over 90% (Education at a Glance, 2012). This means that developed countries are performing well in the early childhood sector. However, in the United States, between 30% and 40% of kindergarten age children are estimated not to be ready for school due to Low parental income (Lee, &Burkman, 2002). In South Asia, 35% of all the children drop out-of-school. In Belize children are sixty times more likely to drop-out in Grade 1 than in Grade 2 (Fiske, Unesco & Collins
Bartholomew Ltd, 2012). These children are at an increased risk of leaving school without graduating.

In Africa, the number of children enrolled in early childhood centers is still low compared to the developed countries. For example in 2007, only 10% of African children aged four to six were enrolled in any form of early childhood programme with an increase of 17% in 2010 (UNESCO 2010). Even with such a significant increase, the number of children enrolled in early childhood education in African countries is still low. In east Africa for example, Ethiopia had 4.2%, Burundi 7%, Rwanda 13.3% and Tanzania 29%. The Education for All Global Monitoring Report in 2010 shows that Uganda has a gross enrolment of 2.1% in nursery schools. This is a decline from the 1999 figure which put the enrolment at 4% (UNICEF, 2012).

According to the UNESCO (2005) Global Monitoring Report, in Guinea-Bissau, Rwanda, Equatorial Guinea, Madagascar and Nepal, more than half the children who enrolled in primary schools repeated first grade or dropped out. These findings indicate that there is a major crisis during the first critical years of primary education across many parts of the developing world. Many children are dropping-out altogether or repeating classes and the vast majority do so within the first two years. The problem is at its worst in countries where poverty, exclusion and other systemic factors exacerbate the situation (Fiske, UNESCO & Collins Bartholomew Ltd, 2012).

Draper (2008) notes that low pre-school enrolment rates in Africa may be explained by high levels of poverty, inadequate health as well as nutrition and cultural practices. According to Robert (2010) Socio-economic status depends on a combination of
variables, including occupation, education, income, wealth, and place of residence. One major reason why these parental influences may impact so strongly on children is because the children spend more than ninety percent of their time from infancy throughout their childhood outside school under the influence of their parents (UNESCO, 2008).

In Kenya, majority of the parents are aware of the importance of providing Early Childhood Education (ECE) but their inability to meet the cost is a challenge to date (KIE, 2005). According to the policy framework on ECE, parental socio economic factors have compromised the abilities of parents to give financial support for the early child Education. These findings are consistent with Kituta (2003) in her research in Shimba Hills in Kwale district that indicated that the majority of the parents do not participate in ECD activities because of financial constraints.

Officially, in Kenya children aged three to five years are expected to be enrolled in ECDE centres. These children are considered eligible for enrolment such that by the age of six they proceed to standard one. Despite the Government policy, currently a large percentage (65 %) of the pre-school children in Kenya is not attending early childhood education inclusively. Pre-school enrolment in Kenya is even much lower when compared to other countries in the Sub-Saharan Africa, the Arab States, the Central Asia and South and West Asia (UNESCO, 2010).

One of the areas where Low enrolment and retention is evident is Bureti Sub-county. According to statistics from the Office of Kericho County, Education office (2013) the enrolment in early childhood education in 2009 was at 44.2%, in 2010 it decreased to
43.5%, 2011 to 42%, an increase in 2012 to 49.64% and in 2013 to 50.14%. Though this statistics represents a good development, it still means that only about half of the children in Bureti have access to ECDE services. This is far below the 60% of MOE 2010 target according to situational analysis final report September (2008).

In spite of the efforts made in Education in Kenya, a number of challenges still persist. These include cost of Education, inequalities and inequity in access to Education, high wastage rates, under-enrolment, grade retention and problem of relevance and quality of Education. The goal to make enrolment in early childhood education compulsory may not be achieved if factors contributing to low enrolment in the ECDE centers are not identified and addressed (Okuom, et al., 2012). For this purpose, the study was designed to assess the effects of parental socio-economic factors on enrolment and retention of preschools in Early Childhood Education.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

While there is consensus internationally among education stakeholders that ECDE places children at a better start for primary education and give them a better chance for achievements later in life, the importance of ECDE is yet to be appreciated. This can be explained by low enrolment in early childhood Education especially in Sub Saharan Africa where the situation is worse with only 40% of children access to ECDE. The situation in Kenya may not be far different from that of Sub Saharan Africa. While there has been an increase in ECDE enrolment in Kenya that is from 35% in 2003 to 60.9% in 2010, a large proportion of pupils who enrol in primary school do not complete the eight-year cycle within the prescribed minimum period and a significant number do not
complete the cycle at all resulting to high wastage in the region. The completion rate of the primary cycle in Bureti Sub-county is 80%. The primary school enrolment in Bureti district was 92% by 2010, which is relatively low as compared to the net enrolment of South-Rift counties, which was 98.3% on the average by the year 2007. Statistics also revealed that drop-out rate in the sub-county is comparatively higher than most of the regions in Kericho County.

This study therefore investigated parental socio-economic characteristics including parents’ level of income, education and parental occupation, and strategies to improve enrolment and retention of primary school pupils in Bureti sub-county, Kericho County.

1.2.1 Purpose of the Study
The main purpose of this study was to determine the influence of parents’ socio-economic factors on enrollment and retention of pre-primary school pupils in Bureti sub-county, Kericho County.

1.2.2 Objectives of the study
This study was guided by the following objectives:

i) To establish the socio-economic characteristics of parents of pre-primary school pupils in Bureti sub-County, Kericho County

ii) To establish whether parent socio-economic factors influence enrolment and retention of pre-primary school pupils in Bureti sub-County, Kericho County

iii) To determine strategies to be put in place to improve enrolment and retention of pre-primary school pupils in Bureti sub-county, Kericho county
1.2.3 Research Questions

i) What is the influence of parents’ socio-economic factors on enrolment and retention of pre-primary school pupils in Bureti sub-county, Kericho County?

ii) What strategic measures should be put in place to improve enrolment and retention of pre-primary school pupils in Bureti sub-county, Kericho County?

1.3 Significance of the study

This study may help the community to improve their focus on pre-school learning process by ensuring there is a high retention progressively. The study may also help the national government gain more insight about the state of early education and inform their plans to improve the situation by making long-term plans. The county government may also benefit from the study by ensuring that its strategic education policies make up for the shortcomings in resource allocation that could be affecting education in the county. The study may provide ECDE stakeholders with more reliable information that is useful in informing their decision on how to support education at entry level.

1.4 Limitation and Delimitation of the Study

The study was limited and delimited to various factors as highlighted in the following sub-sections.

1.4.1 Limitation of the study

The researcher relied on the opinion of teachers and parents of pre-primary schools in Bureti Sub-county. This was a major limitation since these respondents may shy away from giving true information and that they may be victimised. This limitation was
overcome by encouraging the respondents to give correct and genuine information and ensuring they acknowledge the objective of the information sought and offering the highest level of privacy needed.

1.4.2 Delimitation of the Study

This study is delimited to parental level of education, income and occupation. Factors influencing enrolment and retention among the ECDE school pupils vary from one geographical region to another but this study was conducted in only one sub-county hence the results cannot be generalized to the entire country but can be restricted to only those areas that have similar characteristics to the study sub-county. The study was also delimited itself to teachers teaching in pre-primary schools in Bureti Sub-County in Kericho County.

1.5 Assumptions of the Study

The study was conducted under the following assumptions: -

The first assumption is that all respondents would be honest in their responses to the questions. The second assumption is that all respondents are capable of suggesting some of the learner friendly strategies to help in dropouts’ rehabilitation. The third assumption is that improving primary school retention levels would improve transition rates to secondary
1.6 Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

1.6.1 Theoretical Framework

This study used the production function theory by Becker's (1993) to examine the relationship between inputs and outputs in the education system. This theory looks at education as a cumulative process and further posits that the outputs of the education process and the achievement of the student are directly related to inputs. Production is a process, and because it is a flow concept, production is measured as a “rate of output per period of time”; it is a statistical relationship between inputs and outputs. Production function is customarily assumed to specify the maximum output obtainable from a given set of inputs.

The “educational production function” concept was suggested as a viable approach to educational research as early as the late nineteen-sixties. Production function methodology uses correlation methods to demonstrate relationships between input and output in a system. Monk (1992) described production function analysis as the relating of an input measure to an output measure using correlation or multivariate analysis (regression analysis). The common inputs are things like family attributes, school resources, and teacher quality, and the outcome is student achievement.

In his 1958 paper, "The Emerging Economic Scene and Its Relation to High School Education", Schultz wrote about the connections between education and productivity. Schultz identified people as the source of the economic growth when other economists were attributing national growth to improvements in technology. Gary Becker's household production theory directly links household resources and investments to the
educational attainment of children (Becker, 1993). Education is an extremely important determinant in earnings and this fact is why education has become increasingly important to future generations. The job opportunities once available to less educated individuals are becoming scarce as more employers are raising their employment standards.

This theory was relevant to this study since the researcher sought to identify the relationship of socioeconomic status of parents that is the input and pupils enrolment and retention which is the outcome

1.6.2 Conceptual Framework

The study was based on a conceptual model developed by the researcher so as to help identify the answers in the study. The dependent variable for the study is the pupil’s enrolment and retention, while the independent variables are socio-economic factors, parent’s educational background and strategies to be adopted to improve enrolment and retention in pre-primary schools.
Figure 1.1 Conceptual Framework

Source: Developed from Literature, 2016

Key

- Study variables
- Non study variables

Socio-economic factors influence an individual learner’s level of motivation to attend and progress smoothly through primary education. Those pupils who drop out of school end up in occupations like house helps, waged labour or simply idlers (Theuri 2004). Socio-economic factors are aspects within a child’s Family that have an impact on schooling and when well managed, it would have a positive impact such as increased enrolment, reduction in dropout and better achievement.
1.7 Operational Definition of Terms

**Completion**
Refers to a pupil proportion of pupils finishing a certain level of education.

**Dropout rate**
Refers to proportion of pupils enrolled in a given class during an academic year who leave the school system in the course of the academic year without completing the course.

**Early childhood education**
Refers to educational programs offered to children from age 3-6 years.

**Enrolment**
Refers to number of pupils officially enrolled in a given grade or level of education regardless of age.

**Occupation**
A parent's role in society, often a regular activity performed for payment.

**Parent's education**
The highest level of schooling attained by the parents of the pre-school children. The level is either; less than primary, primary, high school, higher, college or university.

**Parent's income**
Is what pre-school parents earn which is measured in terms of how much money a parent earns per month.

**Pre-primary school**
An educational establishment or learning space offering early childhood education to children, usually between the ages of three and five, prior to the commencement of compulsory education at primary school.

**Repetition rate**
Refers to proportion of pupils from a cohort enrolled in a given grade in a given school-year who study in the same grade in the following year.

**Size of the Family**
A fundamental social group in society typically consisting of one or two parents and their children.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

The literature reviewed is presented along the following themes: pre-primary education, enrolment, retention and drop out of primary school pupils, parental socio-economic factors, parental educational background and strategies to improve retention in pre-primary schools.

2.1 Pre-primary Education

Pre-primary education is the provision of education for children before the commencement of statutory education between the ages of three to six years. It is designed to stimulate and support the child’s motor, cognitive, language, social and emotional development.

Kabuku (2012) indicates that the development and expansion of primary education has been a long-standing objective of the government and the people of Kenya since independence in 1963. This has been in response to the desire to combat ignorance, diseases and poverty, which are the major concern for government throughout the world. Additionally, primary education contributes to greater participation in social development of an individual. Therefore, the provision of education and training to all children is fundamental to the success of the government’s overall development strategy.

Draper (2008) argues that education as an investment in human capital can raise the income of the poor. He further asserts that the cost-benefit analysis of educational investment indicates that investment in education yields both social and private returns.
that are much higher in developing countries than the corresponding returns in more advanced countries. In view of this scenario, most developing countries including Kenya have invested heavily in education, especially the primary education sector. While issues of internal efficiency of education are important, the more critical issue is to make sure children enter the schooling system in the first place (Bedi et al., 2002). Mwangangi (2012) asserts that illiteracy manifests itself more among the poor particularly women who constitute 61% of the total population in Kenya. The 1999 population and housing census estimated that there were 4.2 million illiterate adults in Kenya (GOK, 2005).

There is strong consensus among economists (Ilicks 1980, Psaharopoulos & Woodhall 1985, Abagi & Olweya (1998) that education is an important determinant of an individual's earnings as well as economic growth. The government of Kenya is committed to achieving Universal Primary Education (UPE) and Education for All (EFA) in line with the provisions for the right to education for all Kenyans (GOK, 2005b). For the children of primary school age, this right is provided for in the Children's Act, 2001. This is also in line with the Government's commitment to international declarations, protocols, and conventions as resolved in world conferences on EFA held in Jomitien-Thailand 1990, Dakar-Senegal 2000 and by the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) (Mwikali, 2011). So education for all is the obligation and prerogative of the State.

Access refers to opportunity to enrol and participate in learning in an ECE center, it equally means the right to education. It is the opportunity provided for children to be educated, access therefore deals with availability, convenience and ability to be educated. The goal of ECDE in Kenya is to enhance access, equity and quality services for all
children from conception to six years. UNESCO (2006) observes that access to ECD centres is inequitable where poor children from semi-arid, arid and urban slum areas are less likely to be enrolled and retained at pre-schools. Pre-school education is very crucial in giving children a foundation to learning. However, this can be possible if parents enrol their children in pre-school and ensure that the children continue attending school to enable them to acquire the knowledge, skills and concepts that will lay a good foundation for their future learning.

In Kenya, the level of school access is measured using enrolment figures and the population figures with respect to the official school-going age at a given level of education (Blakemore, 2008). The gross enrolment indicates the capacity of the educational system and the rate of its utilization. Sometimes it could be more than 100 percent which is a reflection of the presence of repeaters and late starters. For example in Kenya, the primary school gross enrolment rates in the year 2002 before the introduction of FPE, was 88.2% but increased to 102.8% in 2003 and then 104.8% in 2004 when free primary education was introduced. During such times, over-age children and even adults who were unable to access primary education were enrolled in various public primary schools in the country. In terms of gender, male pupils have higher gross enrolment rates than their female counterparts at the national level though there could be regional variations whereby in some provinces especially Nairobi and Central females have higher gross enrolment rates than the males (Glennerster, 2011).

The principal thrust in government policy on primary education is to accelerate the attainment of education for all. Therefore, to increase access and participation in primary
education firstly, the government strategy is to raise the rate of enrolment in standard 1, increase the primary school completion rate and reduce grade repetition. Secondly, educational participation for handicapped children needs to be emphasized so as to bring it to the same level with that of normal children. Furthermore, institutions offering education outside the formal system should be given support. Also, there is need to improve the nutritional and health status of pupils with attention being given to the special needs of the handicapped (Okuom, et al., 2012). The large gap between gross and net enrolment may be explained by enrolment of tens of thousands 'overage' children, including street children or those who dropped out of school to work and have joined school (GoK, 2005). For instance, in the Mukuru slum area of Nairobi, only about 500 out of 5,000 new student (10%) who enrolled in school since the beginning of the year were of 'normal' school going-age (Mohamed, 2012).

Despite an increase in the initial access to education, many developing countries still experience high dropout rates and this affects MDG and EFA goals around educational access. In many countries, the largest number of out-of-school children are those that enrolled in school, only to drop out later. Drop out is often a process rather than the result of one single event, and therefore it is the result of a combination of factors (Kaumbulu, 2011).

Retention is staying in school until completion of course and dropping out is leaving school prematurely. Dropping out of school represents a waste of human and financial resources, unless pupils acquire basic skills during their time of study (Gakii, 2012). Dropout rates reflect the presence of certain hindrances that bars pupils from accessing
education. Since the inception of the FPE in the year 2003, dropout rate decreased while completion rates improved nationally. However, in some areas like North Eastern Province, dropout rates were high for both boys and girls compared to other provinces, a situation which could be attributed to the nomadic way of life the school going-age children lead (GOK, 2005a). A recent survey (Education Sector Report, 2008) revealed that 37.3 percent of children in Kibera, in Nairobi, are still out of school and the majority of those in school (70 percent) are attending non-formal primary schools. This problem has been compounded by the fact that almost no new schools have been built in slum areas for the last fifteen years, although large population of the city live in the slum.

Despite the evident low enrolment and retention of pupils in pre-primary schools, there seems to be no studies that have been done to ascertain the factors that cause these occurrences. This study aimed to establish these factors as the researcher believes that it is only when these factors are known that a solution to this situation can be found.

2.2 Influence of Parental Socio-economic Factors on Enrolment and Retention of Pre-primary School Pupils

Despite the undisputable role of education as a prerequisite for development, the Education for All Global Monitoring Report (2010) pointed out that 72 million children were not enrolled in schools. In cases where they get enrolled, there is yet a challenge of low pupil retention in schools. Enrolment and low retention of children in schools has remained a global challenge. Studies indicate that parental socio-economic characteristics are among the major factors that contribute to low pupil’s enrolment and retention in pre-primary schools (UNESCO, 2010).
Socio-economic factors can be defined as a person’s overall social position to which attainments in both the social and economic domain contributes (Ainley, 1995). When used in studies of children’s school access and attendance, it refers to the socio-economic status of the parents or family. Socio-economic status is determined by an individual’s achievements in: education; employment and occupational status; and income and wealth (UNESCO, 2010).

2.2.1 Influence of Parental Level of Education on Pupil’s Enrolment and Retention

Parental education is a significant predictor of child achievement which determines retention. In an analysis of data from several large-scale developmental studies in the US, Duncan and Brooks-Gunn (1997) concluded that maternal education was linked significantly to children's intellectual outcomes even after controlling for a variety of other social economic status indicators such as household income.

According to Cogneau, Bossuory, De Vreyer, (2006), parents who are unskilled are more often than not of low educational attainment, take little interest in their children's schoolwork, have larger families, live in overcrowded homes lacking amenities and tend to send their children to schools which are ill-equipped this results in low academic performance, higher rates of grade retention and higher percentage of children not enrolled in schools.

A study was conducted by Namukwaya (2014) whose title was “Factors Affecting Primary School Enrolment and Retention of Pupils in Kotido District, Uganda”. This study investigated factors that affect enrolment and retention of pupils from Primary one until Primary seven. The study found out that educational level of household members is
influential particularly on children and it determines their access to schooling. The notion is widely accepted as the most consistent determinant of child education. Also higher parental or household head level of education is associated with increased access to education. Parental education and retention in school has been linked by putting forward many reasons and opinions of scholars. It has been observed that non-educated parents cannot provide the support or often do not appreciate the benefits of schooling (Namukwaya, 2014).

Warrah (2008) states that fathers’ education was significant to the schooling of both sons and daughters. But mothers’ education has significant impact only on daughters’ schooling in order to bolster sustained access to education for many children.

Parental level of education basically means the type of education acquired by a parent; it can be western or religious depending on the environment and geographical location. Educational background may be the number of schools attended and the type of certificates obtained right from primary to tertiary level. Pupils from families where parents have less education tend to systematically perform worse in schools than pupils whose parents have more education (Namukwaya, 2014). Education is regarded as a critical factor in alleviation of individual ignorance, fear, and servility in helping countries (Sava, 2014).

Nannyonjo (2007) asserted that education level of parents and the prevailing fashion in the society are likely to influence the demand for education. There is therefore, a strong likelihood that parents will educate their children beyond the level they attained. This may partly account for the increased demand for primary and secondary education in
Kenya today. Higher educational attainment for a household head significantly reduces the likelihood of being poor. Students from the educated parents who attended and finished senior four or senior 6 or university performed considerably better than the students with parents who did not finish primary or just finished primary school.

Parents who were educated had better attitudes towards their children’s schooling than the illiterate ones. According to a research study by UNESCO (2010), illiteracy level is high in Kenya and Africa at large; 142 million African adults are illiterate. Virtually all successful programmes are influenced by education and participation and other researchers have confirmed the same. Illiterate parents denied their children enrolment in ECD centres in order to stay at home with their siblings as they went to fetch water and perform other household chores (UNESCO, 2010).

Most communities in Kenya value education of their children because there are certain economic aspects attached to it. Having education is also seen as a means of getting a job or establishing a business. This has influenced positively the access to free primary education. Research has consistently found that socio-economic status, most commonly measured by parental education and income, is a powerful predictor of school achievement and dropout trend. Father’s education, which may be a proxy for his perception, is found to have a significant impact on the schooling of boys and girls; the mother's perception influences only the girl's schooling. In addition, mother's lack of education increases the risk of early withdrawal of girls than boys (Achoka, 2007).

Several studies have dealt with how parental income influence enrolment and retention of primary schools but they have not studied the influence of parental income on
enrolment and retention in pre-primary school pupils thus the study sought to find out the influence of parental income on enrolment and retention of pre-school pupils.

2.2.2 Influence of Parental Level of Income on Pupil’s Enrolment and Retention

Parental level of income has an effect on children’s educational gains. The per capita expenditure by the parent is an indicator of the continuous income of the family. The amount of per capita expenditure has a positive effect on school achievement. For this reason, the increases in the continuous income of the family facilitate the increase in literacy and rise of school achievement in both boys and girls at all stages of education.

According to the PISA study, the economic status of a pupil’s family has an impact on enrolment and retention of pre-school pupils. The results of the PISA study show that this relationship is positive. It can be said that those pupils with families who are financially in a good conditions are more successful compared to those who are not.

World Bank (2007), reported that dropout and repetition in primary school is common among pupils from low socio-economic background and more prevalent in rural areas than urban areas. Low enrolment in school is attributed to high cost, parental child gender preference, and parental attitude towards Education. According to Hunt (2008) children with low socio-economic mobility characteristics have less chances of attending school and that children from better-off households are more likely to enrol and remain in school. The study further indicated that children from poorer households have fewer chances of enrolling in school or have higher chances of dropping out after they have enrolled (Hunt, 2008).
In developed countries like USA, children growing up in poverty are directly exposed to risks like illnesses, crowding and family stress, lack of psychosocial stimulation, limited resources which leads to poor performance in schools, absenteeism and grade retention. These children often experience more serious consequences to risks than children from higher income families (UNESCO, 2006).

Hardship on child rearing and deprivation through insecure housing conditions and a lack of good food and basic necessities leads to poor performance, retention and low enrolment in schools (Redmond, 2008). Children from low income families often do not experience the supportive conditions that foster their readiness to learn and are frequently exposed to harsh physical and social environments that impact negatively on their capacity and desire to learn and go to school. These children suffer greater family turmoil, violence, and separation from their parents. Their parents are more nonresponsive and harsh, and they live in more chaotic households, with fewer routines, less structure, and greater instability all which leads to poor performance, late enrolments for school and high rates of retention.

In determining access to education by children, household income is found to be an important factor; this is because there are many costs associated with schooling and educational process ranging from school fees, uniform PTA fees and the opportunity costs of sending a female-child to school. Household income is linked to a range of factors: when children start school, how often they attend, whether they have to temporarily withdraw and also when, and if they drop out (Barrera-Osorio et al; Glewe & Chang 2010). The link between socio-economic and educational background of the
parents and children educational process had been highlighted by number of studies in looking at the interaction between the children in particular and the household income and socio-economic status. All the studies agreed that children’s enrolment, retention and completion can seriously be affected by the low socio-economic status and low educational level of the parents which resulted to poverty.

Children from better off households are more likely to remain in school, whilst those who are poorer are more likely never to have attended, or to drop out once they have enrolled. This has been suggested by both statistical data and empirical research. For example, a research conducted in rural China by Glewe & Kreme (2006) saw poor and credit constrained children three times more likely than other children to drop out of primary school. The links between wealth and school retention has been described in more detail by Colclough (2000) where he stated that “amongst those out-of-school, the mean wealth index for school drop-outs was generally higher than for those who had never enrolled ... children at school were, on average, from better-off households than those who had dropped out, who were, in turn, from richer backgrounds than school-age children who had never enrolled”. Poor households tend to have lower demand for schooling than richer households: whatever the benefits of schooling, the costs, for them, are more difficult to meet than is the case for richer households. The pressure on children from poorer background in particular, to withdraw from school increases as they get older, particularly as the opportunity cost of their time increases (Colclough et al., 2000).

The major reasons parents offer for not educating their children or for removing them from the school are no more than the fees for registration and admission, examination,
Parent Teachers Association (PTA) fees, the cost of books and uniforms, the provision of other daily monetary demands to their daughters, and the cost of transportation to and from the school on daily basis. These reasons have been discussed from several perspectives. Graham-Browne (1991) and Nejema (1993) argue that low socio-economic status which include poverty and the fiscal crises which force families to cover shortfalls have a devastating impact on household’s and the education system as far as children’s education is concerned. Glewwe& Chang (2010) link the severity of direct costs with the shift of educational costs to parents in the name of cost sharing.

In Kenya, Gakuru (1992) explored the relationship between parental level of income and preschool education in Kenya. The study found that social-economic status of parents in a given area influences enrolments in pre-schools whereby well off parents are able to take their children to high cost private schools and the poor parents manage to take children to poorly equipped pre-schools in both private and public schools without enough qualified teachers. The study also found that enrolment of children in the pre-school education was not prioritized by the government because children would still join standard one (primary school) without going through pre-school education. The study further states that, despite efforts to expand nursery school opportunities, still majority of children both in urban and rural areas were not attending the pre-school education. That was in 1992 and enrolment of children in pre-schools in the whole country remains low. However the study gave a lot of information on enrolment status in pre-schools in Kenya, the study did not establish the relationship between parental socio economic status and enrolment or grade retention in the pre-school education which the current study addresses. In spite of the efforts made in Education, a number of challenges still persist. These include cost of
education, inequalities and inequity in access to education, high wastage rates, under-
enrolment, grade retention and problem of relevance and quality. The current socio-
economic status of parents in the framework of poverty indeed contributes to poor
academic performance in schools, low enrolments at school and high rate of retention
(Cogneau, 2006). Despite all these, study findings are not consistent on the effect of
parents’ level of income on enrollment and retention of pre-primary school pupils, which
is the aim of this study.

2.2.3 Influence of Parental Occupation on Pupil’s Enrolment and Retention

Parents of different occupational classes often have different styles of child rearing,
different ways of disciplining their children and different ways of reacting to their
children. These differences do not express themselves consistently as expected in the case
of every family; rather they influence the average tendencies of families for different
occupational classes. These styles therefore affect children’s education in terms of
performance and early or rate enrolment

In Netherlands, Maarten (2012) found that occupational status effect children's education
regardless of who contributed to it, while in Pakistan Bhalotra & Heady (2003); Basu,
Das and Dutta, (2003) have emphasized that fathers who are in salaried employment are
more likely to be aware of the importance of education and hence invest more in their
children's education. On the other hand, Weiss (2003) established that mothers who
worked part time had higher involvement in their children's school work which included
taking children to school and assisting their children with school work which was likely
to lower grade retention. Therefore, parents are less likely to invest in their children's
education when direct occupational transmission or transference of capital is a viable option to obtain a good position in society for their children. Hence farmers and business owners may have less need to invest in their children's education than people in dependent employment.

In Africa, more than 70% of the continent's poor people live in rural areas and depend on agriculture for food and livelihood (Myres, 1995). Poverty is one of the most important factors that impede young children's development all over the world. Many poor children are denied the opportunity to go to school. Even young children - 5-7 year olds may be expected to care for younger siblings, watch over livestock, shoo away wild animals from crops/gardens, and collect water and firewood. Other children join school unready to learn. These children do poorly, repeat, and drop-out at high rates (Weitzman, 2003).

In Kenya, a study done on patterns of school enrolment in primary school education comparing urban slum, urban non-slum and rural children shows that enrolment is higher in urban non-slum children than in urban slum, and is higher in slums than in rural areas (Mugisha, 2006). Due to poverty in Kenya, many parents find difficulties in paying school levies and buying school uniform. This makes them to withdraw their children from school; hence many children from poor and uneducated home are persistently absent, retained in classes and subsequently drop out of school.

Parent’s occupation is a component of socioeconomic status which encompasses both income and educational attainment. Occupational status reflects the educational attainment required to obtain a job and income levels. When parents have a better occupation, they make adequate provision for their children education. They provide
economic, social, psychological and emotional support to their children, and this would make it possible for the children to perform well in their educational attainment.

According to Marnot, (2014) Occupations are ranked into most prestigious occupation and lower ranking occupation. The most prestigious occupations are physicians, surgeons, lawyers, chemical & biomedical engineers, and communication analysts. While lower ranking occupation are food preparation workers, counter attendants, bartenders and helpers, dishwashers, janitors, maids and housekeepers, vehicle cleaners, and parking lot attendants. The job consider as high status in classification provides more challenging works, ability and greater control over working conditions. While those considered less valued in classification paid significantly less and more laborious, very hazardous and provided less autonomy.

Gachathi (2006) indicated that occupational prestige is a component of socioeconomic status encompasses both income and educational attainment. To him, occupational status reflects the educational attainment required to obtain a job and income levels. When parents have a better occupation, they make adequate provision for their children education. They provide economic, social, psychological and emotional support to their children, and this would make it possible for the children to perform well in their educational attainment.

Most researches have dealt with how occupational influence education but there is no research done on how occupational influence the enrolment and retention of pre-primary school pupils thus the aim of this study.
2.3 Strategies to Improve Enrolment and Retention

Economic policies and institutional structures should be modified to improve production, accessibility to the market, raise income and lower the vulnerability of the poor people (Tooley, 2012). The rural poor should be empowered. The pre-primary schools should be made basic education free and compulsory. The causes of poverty should be brought under control through subsidizing farmers inputs and provision of market for market produce and provision of insurance; provision of security; creation of job opportunities directly/indirectly; improving the terms and conditions of workers by declaring the least wages; provision of accountability and transparency in governance; instituting sound legal frameworks dealing with land tenures and adjudication systems; provision of adequate and good infrastructure; and provision of low subsidized cost of social services in education and health sectors (Adoyo, 2014).

The pre-primary schools parents should be made aware of the importance of their children partaking of the rich experiences offered by pre-primary schools which provide a head start to a solid foundation for development of lifelong learning. The parents are advised that the kind of environment at home, both physical and psychological are key as they determine the behavioural characteristics and attitudes of a child which in turn greatly influence the ability of the child in coping with learning activities away from home.

The public should be made aware of the overall picture of HIV/AIDS on enrolment for basic education in Kenya is negative impact on the potential clientele through the rapid growth in the number of orphans and increase in the street children. The MOEST should
have a well-designed educational programmes for the young which can clearly affect their lives for the better, both during their school years and beyond, and also enhance the intellectual, physical and psychological development of children, particularly the handicapped (MOEST, 2007). The MOEST should recognize the ECDE programmes as part of the mainstream education system in line with the Dakar Framework for EFA. The ECDE programme should be streamlined in terms of management, registration, and quality assurance and funding (Wanjiru, 2007). This will help the parents to enrol their pupils in school. Also by funding the poor pupils it will make them retained in school.

There should an adequate policy framework in the Provision of ECDE to avoid a scenario where centers of learning have tended to adhere to different curricular whose outcomes are not uniform. This creates a match for children’s entry behaviour to primary schools and ensures quality. The Government of Kenya should allocate in its budgetary recurrent expenditure on education to ECDE (Tooley, 2012).

2.4 Summary of Literature Reviewed

From the foregoing literature however, it is clear that many studies done on the influence of parental socio-economic factors and parents level of education on enrolment and retention of children in early childhood development and education centres have failed to satisfactorily establish the relationships between the specific parental socioeconomic aspects as per the purpose of this study. Despite the fact that many studies have been carried out to identify the factors related to the low ECDE enrolment and retention, the problem is still unsolved. Many studies in Kenya, Africa, and other parts of the world reveal inconsistent findings about the factors associated with pre-school pupils retention
and enrolment. Hence this study seeks to ascertain these findings. Owing to these shortcomings, the study in depth attempts to establish how parental socio-economic factors and educational background influence enrolment and retention of early childhood education.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the research design, variables, target population, sampling technique and size, research instruments, procedure for data collection, piloting, reliability and data analysis plan.

3.1 Research Design

Descriptive survey design was used in this study to explore the parental socio-economic characteristics that influence enrolment and retention of children in public pre-schools. Orodho (2005) noted that descriptive survey designs are used in preliminary and exploratory studies to allow researchers to gather information, summarize, present and interpret for the purpose of clarification. Descriptive survey design was appropriate in this study because it is the best method available to social scientists and other educators who are interested in collecting original data for the purpose of describing a population which is too large to observe directly (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003).

3.2 Variables of the Study

The study investigated the dependent and independent variables described below.

3.2.1 Dependent variable

Dependent variable was enrolment and retention.
3.2.2 Independent Variables

Independent variables were parent's Socio economic status and were conceptualized as follows:

Parents' Level of Income: Parent's level of income was investigated in terms of; ability to pay school fee, ability to support school programmes and average monthly income specifically categorized as. Below 1500 [very low] 1500-1999 [low] 2000 - 5500 [medium] 5501 and above [high]

Parents' Education: The level of education of parents was measured in terms of; the highest academic qualification attained (Below primary, primary, high school, higher college and university)

Parents' Occupation: Parent's occupation was measured in terms of; the type of job a parent has whether highly skilled with high level of education (White collar job), Semi-skilled jobs and peasant

3.3 Location of the Study

The study was carried out in Bureti sub-county, Kericho County. The main source of livelihood in the district is tea growing, livestock rearing and growing of food crops like maize, pineapples and beans for consumption. This could imply that the people in the study could be in a position to engage in agricultural activities and hence improve their socio-economic status. The ideal setting for any study should be easily accessible to the researcher and should be that which permits instant rapport with the informants (Singleton, 1993). Despite the fact that Community Support Grant (CSG) has been
introduced in the sub-county, enrolled children in public pre-schools are still dropping out of school. Thus it was for this reason that the sub-county was chosen as the location of the study.

3.4 Target Population

The study targeted pre-schools teachers teaching in 73 public pre-schools in Bureti sub-county. A total of 219 pre-school teachers were targeted. These were the teachers who were with the children in school and therefore qualify to have relevant information in regard to the study.

3.5 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

3.5.1 Sampling Techniques

This being a survey, it was to seek and gather data on the access of pre-primary pupils to ECDE schools in Bureti sub-county, Kericho County, Kenya. The study used purposive sampling to select schools that would provide information on the variations in terms of organizations structure and social-economic context of ECDE institutions. This was because they were in good position to give important information in relation to ECDE enrolment and retention trends.

3.5.2 Sample Size

The researcher used 30% of the target population as proposed by Gay, (1981) who states that a 30 percent of a population can be used as a sample to represent the whole population.

32
A total of 66 pre-school teachers were sampled. Three teachers will be randomly selected in each school, one from each class that is Baby class, pre-primary I and II. Table 3.1 below provides the sampling frame that was used for the study.

**Table 3.1: Sample Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample size (30%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Schools</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDE teachers</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 **Research Instruments**

The researcher made use of a questionnaire to collect data; the teachers’ questionnaires. The questionnaire had two sections. Section A was on demographic data and section B focused on socio-economic factors such as level of income, parent’s occupation and size of the family. This section also had strategic measures that can be used to address low enrolment and retention in pre-primary schools in Bureti Sub-county in Kericho County.

3.7 **Pilot study**

Piloting Study The pilot study was conducted to ten teachers who were from another schools which were not from sampled school to a certain the validity and the reliability of the instruments.

3.8 **Validity and Reliability of Instruments**

Validity is the degree to which a test measures what it purports to measure (Borg and Gall 2003). Content validity of a measuring instrument is the extent to which it provides adequate coverage of the investigative questions guiding the study (Mugenda, Mugenda,
Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003).

### 3.8.1 Instruments Validity

Validity of the data was ensured through content validity where expert opinion and the supervisors' input were sought. This helped to ascertain that the items produced relevant responses for the study. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) asserts that experienced researchers should be used to determine the content validity of research instruments. Thus the researcher availed the instrument to the supervisors to evaluate the exactness and adequacy of the items in the questionnaire.

### 3.8.2 Instruments Reliability

Pilot study was done in different schools that were not included in the sampled schools with ten teachers and repeated after one week to show the reliability of the instruments. This yielded two scores for each person and the correlation between these two sets of scores is the test-retest reliability coefficient. The reliability coefficient is determined by the following formula:

$$ R = \frac{\sigma_t^2}{\sigma_t^2 + \sigma_e^2} $$

Where $R$ is the reliability coefficient

- $\sigma_t^2$ - is the variance in the data scores
- $\sigma_e^2$ - is the error variance
Analysis and interpretation of pilot study’s data was done to establish whether the instruments can be depended on for the study. The study used the Cronbach’s Alpha test to test the reliability of the instruments. The alpha value usually ranges between 0 and 1 with reliability increasing with the increase in value. A high coefficient implies that items correlate highly among themselves i.e. there is consistency among items in measuring the concept of interest (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999). Coefficient of 0.6 - 0.7 is a commonly accepted rule of thumb that indicates acceptable reliability and 0.8 or higher indicated good reliability.

3.9 Data Collection Procedure
The researcher sought a permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI), and then would get clearance from Bureti sub-county District Education Officer’s office before commencing data collection. The researcher visited the selected schools to administer the research instruments. Data was collected and analyzed from the teachers by means of a questionnaire. Research instruments for the pilot were administered personally by the researcher. The researcher enlisted the help of research assistants for data collection. Where a respondent was not able to complete the questionnaire immediately; arrangements were made to collect it at a later time.

3.10 Data Analysis Techniques
The data in this research was analyzed by use of descriptive statistics. Quantitative data was analyzed using the statistical software; Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The quantitative data was tabulated and analyzed by descriptive statistics including frequency and percentages presented through tables and figures to show sample
characteristics and major patterns emerging from the data. Qualitative data was analyzed through descriptive statements and the results were presented through charts and graphs from which generalization and conclusions were made.

3.10 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

After approval of the research proposal by the supervisors, the researcher sought permission from Kenyatta University graduate school. The researcher informed all the necessary authorities i.e. the head teachers and teachers of the sampled schools the intention to conduct a research and book the appointments with them. The researcher then informs the participants that the information given would be treated with a lot of confidentiality. The researcher did not collect personal details like names and telephones numbers in order to ensure nondisclosure of identity.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.0 Introduction

The data was collected, analyzed, findings presented and discussed under the themes derived from the objectives of the study. Out of 66 questionnaires distributed to 66 pre-school teachers, 64 questionnaires were returned making it 97% response rate.

The research sought to investigate the influence of parental socio economic factors on Enrolment and retention of pre-primary school in Bureti Sub-County. The following objectives were the focus of the study:

i. To establish the socio-economic characteristics of parents of pre-primary school pupils in Bureti sub-County, Kericho County

ii. To establish whether parent socio-economic factors influence enrolment and retention of pre-primary school pupils in Bureti sub-County, Kericho County

iii. To determine strategies to be put in place to improve enrolment and retention of pre-primary school pupils in Bureti sub-county, Kericho county

4.1 Respondents’ Personal Information

The teachers’ characteristics including sex, age, level of education and their teaching experience are prescribed in Table 4.1 below.
Table 4.1: Demographic characteristics of the teacher Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-certificate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in ECDE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in ECDE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BED</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N= 64</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of 64 teachers sampled in this study, 67.19 percent were female while 32.81 percent were male. In regard to their ages, majority (39%) were aged between 35-49 years followed by those between 25 and 34 years who constituted 25 percent of the sample. Nine teachers was aged between 15-24 years.

The distribution of teachers by level of education was almost normal, with teachers holding ECDE certificate being the majority (32.8%). The teachers with P1-certificate came second constituting 29.69 percent while Bachelor of Education holders were the least representing only 10.94 percent. In regard to teaching experiences, slightly above average (51.56%) teachers had 5-10 years of experience. Moreover, a quarter of teachers had at least 11 years of experience and one out of five had four years of experience at most.
From table 4.1 above majority (67%) of teachers are female and that community perceive female gender as being preschool teachers as opposed to male teachers. Young preschool male teachers are fading off. This means that preschool section is being neglected by young scholars which might affect the future learning in preschools. This is associated with under and unemployment as well as poor remuneration of preschool teachers. In addition, natural attrition of the present aging teachers the preschools are likely to lose their experienced teachers. Age is positively related to teachers’ years of experience since more teachers have more than 5 years of experience in teaching. Insignificant sizeable proportions of preschool teachers have degree in education and majority has certificates. This implies that the quality of preschool education is in doubtful regarding the quality of education hence may affect retention of children with parents withdrawing their children to their choice.

4.2 Socio-Economic Characteristics of Parents of Pre-Primary School Pupils

The first objective sought to determine socio-economic characteristics of parents of pre- primary school pupils in Bureti Sub-County. Results are represented in Table 4.2. When the respondents were asked whether parents’ socio-economic characteristics affect enrolment and retention of pre-school children, majority of them 73.4% (47) agreed while 17 out of 64 disagreed. Fig. 4.1 below illustrates the findings.
According to figure 4.1 majority of respondents pointed out that Parents education level (68.75%), Size of the family (64.06%), parent’s occupation (73.44%) and level of income (71.88%) are among the specific parents’ socio-economic characteristics that affects children enrolment and retention in Bureti Sub-county pre-schools while 57.81% and 78.13% disagree that structure of the family and parents’ marital status affect enrolment and retention respectively. These imply that educated parents would want to have their children get enrolled and complete school as required. This parent tends to understand the importance of education than uneducated parent who might think that child getting enrolled in school is a waste of time and resources and have little fruits in the end. Similarly, small families and parents earning more income are in a position to support their children in terms of paying school fees and other school requirements. This concurs
with Nannyonjo (2007) who states that education level of parents and the prevailing fashion in the society are likely to influence the demand for education.

4.3 Effect of Socio-economic Factors on Enrolment and Retention of pupils

4.3.1 Level of Education of Parents

This study intended to find out the educational level of parents or guardians of the pre-primary school pupils. As such, the teachers were asked to indicate the educational level of their pupils’ parents/guardians. The educational levels included primary, secondary, diploma, university and non-formal education.

Table 4.2 Parents’ level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents’ level of Education</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non formal education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45.3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary level</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary level</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.0625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results revealed that large number of the parents or guardians 29 (45.3%) were non-formal education and their pupils had dropped out of school or never attended school while the large number of the parents with pupils in school had primary and secondary education.

The teachers were further asked to indicate their extent of agreement on various statements regarding the influence that the parental level of education had on their pupil’s enrolment and retention.
According to Table 4.3, majority of respondents 70% (mean=3.5247) agreed that uneducated parents don’t educate their sons & daughters, 69% (mean=3.4823) opined that most parents never attended school, hence do not bother with their children attending school and 58% (mean=2.9) agreed that uneducated parents encourage their sons to go to school as a way of compensation for their parents’ education. Being unprofessional is a state that will likely not make someone a role model for the children. This fact concurred
with the research done by the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MOEST, 2007) on professionalism and child modelling. This research argued that parents with professional qualifications ensure that their children remain in school, and on the other hand parents with low levels of education have negative attitude towards education because they do not see its immediate benefits. This low level of education of the parents therefore may negatively influence child enrolment and drop-out from pre-primary schools in Bureti sub-county.

The above argument is also supported by (Shuma, 2007) who observed that there is positive correlation between dropout pupils and education level of their parents. Results regarding the influence of education dropout of their children further revealed that within the village some parents did not value education. Parents were much more concerned with agricultural activities than education. They believed that to send a child to school was just a waste of time and economic resources. Parents value more agricultural activities than education because they believe that agriculture is their only sustainable source of family income.
Table 4.4 Correlation between Parental Level of Education and enrolment and retention of pre-school children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Parental level of Education</th>
<th>Children enrolment and retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Level of Education</td>
<td>Pearson’s correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6090*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig(2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children enrollment and retention</td>
<td>Pearson’s correlation</td>
<td>0.6090*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig(2 tailed)</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation significance level=0.05

Table 4.4 shows that the correlation coefficient between parental level of education and children enrolment and retention is $r = +0.6090$ and $p= 0.0031<0.05$ implying that there is a very strong positive correlation between parental level of education and pre-school children enrolment and retention. The level of education possessed by a parent has a positive influence on the enrolment and retention of his/her children in school. This is simply because; a parent who is highly educated is in a better position of offering mentorship to the child as well as acting as a role model in his/her educational journey.

From the above presentations, it can be deducted that indeed the parental level of education is a vital characteristics that influences the enrolment and retention of a child to a greater extent. This finding however contradicts with some earlier findings made by
Shapiro (2009) on his study that parental education level is not an important factor in the academic success of pupils.

On the other hand, the studies by Tavani & Losh (2013) and Hill, Castellino, Lansford, Nowlin, Dodge, Bates, & Pettit (2012) support the findings of this study by showing that parental education plays a significant role in the retention of primary school pupils. The study by Tavani and Losh (2003) further showed that higher levels of education of parents and parental involvement both had positive impacts on the pupils’ retention.

4.3.2 Parents Level of Income and Occupation

This study also intended to establish the influence of parental income on enrollment and retention. Under parental income the researcher looked at the parent’s occupation and parental income.

Parent’s occupation means the kind of work the parent does for his living. It is presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Parents Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>self employed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher requested the respondents to indicate parents’ occupation so as to assess their income. Majority of the respondents 29 (45%) indicated that parents were casual
workers, 21 (32%) indicated that school parents were farmers, 38 (18%) indicated that the parents were salaried, 6 (9%) the parents were self-employed while 1 (2%) were not employed at all.

This shows that their earnings were gotten from casual work which may not be enough to meet all the basic needs leave alone education. This little income from casual work may not be enough to support education hence low level of child retention in school.

Regarding level of income, this study requested the respondents to indicate the amount of income received by the parents. Parents’ income refers to what the parent earns at the end of the month as salary or wage.

![Figure 4.2 Parents’ Income](image)

The survey found out that majority of the parents, 24 (37.5%) earn between 3,000/= to 5,000/= per month, 16 (25%) of the respondents suggested that parents earned 6,000/= to 8,000/=, 14 (21%) of the parents earned below 3,000/= and 9 (14%) of the parents earned
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above 8,000/= per month. This implied that the majority of parents earned little income, hence making it hard to pay for their son’s education a fact that may lead to child drop out.

Further the researcher requested the respondents to fill a 5 likert scale questionnaire item with Strongly Agree (SA) = 5, Agree (A) =4, Undecided (U) =3, Disagree (D) =2 and Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1. The responses were presented in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 Influence of Level of Income on Enrolment and Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High parental income goes hand in hand with child drop out</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>3.0021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who drop out of school come from homes where parents have little income</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>3.8654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>77.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils from well up families have little chances of dropping out of school</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>3.5476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>70.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils whose parents are stable financially drop out of school because they don’t see the need of education since they are provided with all basic needs</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>3.1087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>62.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results from Table 4.6 revealed that majority 77.3% (mean=3.8654) of the respondents were of the opinion that pupils who drop out of school come from homes where parents have little income and 60% (mean=3.0) were of the opinion that high parental income goes hand in hand with child drop out in pre-primary schools in Bureti Sub-County. This response implied that parental income influences pupils drop out i.e. if the parents have no income their sons and daughters may drop out of school.

**Table 4.7: Relationship between parental income and drop out**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Parental Level of Income</th>
<th>Children enrollment and retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Level of Income</td>
<td>Pearson’s correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.622*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig(2 tailed)</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children enrollment and retention</td>
<td>Pearson’s correlation</td>
<td>0.622*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig(2 tailed)</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation significance level=0.05

Table 4.7 shows that the correlation coefficient between parental income and child drop out is $r = +0.622$ implying that there is a very strong positive correlation between parental income and child drop out. From the findings there is a very strong positive relationship between parental income and child drop out hence conclude that child may drop out of pre-primary schools due to parental income.
Franklin, S. & Smith J. (2011) concur with the findings that the level of the family income is one of the most powerful influences on primary school enrolments rates in the developing countries. Edet, and Ekegre, (2010), showed that parental socio-economic background influences their children’s participation in education. This is especially so for the developing countries where children of the poor families are not provided with adequate educational materials and most are not apt to enrol in school. If enrolled, they are more likely to drop out of school than children who are from better-off families.

4.3.3 Size of the Family

This study also sought to find out the influence of family size on child drop out from pre-primary schools in Bureti sub-county. To achieve this objective the researcher investigated the number of members in a family. The respondents were required to indicate the number of family members where the children come from.

Figure 4.3 Number of Family Members
The survey found out that majority of the respondents 45.31% (29) had between 2-4 members, 12 (19%) had between 5-7 members while 4 (6%) had more than 7 members. This implies that most families in Bureti sub-county have between 2-4 members which are relatively not a big number. Family size therefore influences child drop out from pre-primary schools.

Further the researcher requested the respondents to fill a 5 likert scale questionnaire item with Strongly Agree (SA) = 5, Agree (A) =4, Undecided (U) =3, Disagree (D)=2 and Strongly Disagree(SD) = 1. The responses were presented in Table 4.8.

**Table 4.8 Influence of Family Size on Child Enrolment and Retention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children from families of 2-4 members drop out of school</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>3.6784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.9103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children from families with 5 and above members don’t complete Form 4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>3.5476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.8962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents with 7 children and above don’t pay school fees for their sons</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>3.9847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is likelihood of children who have all their basic needs drop out of school before pre-school period</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>3.0451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.8637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results in Table 4.8 indicated that 79% (mean=3.98) opined that Parents with 7 children and above don’t pay school fees for their sons while 60% (mean=3.045) agreed that there is likelihood of children who have all their basic needs drop out of school before pre-school period. This implies that child dropped out of pre-primary schools either from big families or even when all their basic needs are not met.

Table 4.9: Relationship between Family Size and Child Enrolment and Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>Pearson’s correlation</th>
<th>Children enrollment and retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.622*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig(2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children enrollment and retention</th>
<th>Pearson’s correlation</th>
<th>Children enrollment and retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children enrollment and retention</td>
<td>0.512*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig(2 tailed)</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation significance level=0.05

Table 4.9 shows that the correlation coefficient between family size and child drop out is $r= +0.512$ implying that there is a strong positive correlation between family size and child drop out. Big family or small family therefore may influence child drop out from pre-primary schools. This finding rejects the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between family size and child enrollment and drop out because there is a positive
relationship between the variables; family size and child enrolment and retention in pre-primary schools in Bureti sub-county.

This finding concurs with what Mudembo (2013) argued; that it may be hard to educate children in big families because if getting food is a problem, then it cannot be possible to cater for education which is more expensive. Children from big families were found to drop out from school as they grow bigger. This finding was supported by a research done by the MOE in 2006. The research showed that children from big families may drop out since their parents are not in a position to meet school fees.

Objective three was: To determine strategies to be put in place to improve enrolment and retention of pre-primary school pupils in Bureti sub-county, Kericho county

4.4 Strategies of Improving Enrolment and Retention

The respondents were asked to state their agreement on some specified strategies which can be used to influence positively the enrolment and retention of children in pre-primary schools in Bureti Sub-County. The multiple responses were categorized as yes, not sure and no. The results were then presented in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10 Strategies to improve enrolment and retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of school feeding programme</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>2.2657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>75.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The implementation of Children’s Act 2001</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>2.3018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>76.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of Early Childhood Development Education</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>2.6103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>87.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of child friendly schools and inclusive education</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>2.2358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>74.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of teaching and learning resources</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>2.3189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>77.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of school infrastructure</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>2.1357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>71.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship for orphans</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>2.6547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>88.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a normal class size</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>1.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>66.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having both male and female teacher</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>1.9881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>66.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward good performers</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>2.4351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>81.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-teacher discussions</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>2.8763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>95.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 4.10, majority of responses 95% pointed out that parent involvement through parent-teacher discussion is one of the strategy to improve child enrolment and
retention. Other responses were sponsorships for orphans (88%), Rewarding good performers (81%), provision of teaching and learning resources (77.3%) and implementation of feeding programme (75.5%), among others. This finding therefore implies that parents should be involved right from enrolment and throughout pre-school period. This suggests that any factor that may contribute to drop out may be discussed and handle at early stage by the parents and teachers. Parental involvement is in accordance with the findings of Foster & Perkins (2009). These were seen to develop the academics and behavioural skills of the learners and gave positive results. This is also supported by the findings of Glennerster et al (2011).

Figure 4.4 Strategies to improve enrolment and retentions
Rewarding good performance motivates and boosts the morale of a learner, causing them to enjoy the learning process. This helps integrate a learner into the academic system of the school.

The schools also rewarded the good performers as a way of increasing performance as suggested by Glennerster, et al (2011). Waithira (2010) suggested that schools should promote all low achievers, provide them with additional instruction support and give them same teachers for two to three years. This was contrary to the practice in schools where poor performers were paraded and even made to repeat the same class.

Sabates, Akyeampong, Westbrook and Hunt, (2010) on the other hand suggested in their findings that repetition, which could be as a result of lack of family support in the learning process, could be controlled by expanding parental involvement to include family literacy programs that teach parents how to support literacy with their children. He also advocated for multi-age classroom where pupils have more time to learn and advance to the next level. These would finally encourage the pupils to continue attending school, thus improving retention.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.0 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the study and presents conclusions and recommendations for the different stakeholders on the influence of parent’s socio-economic status on enrolment and retention of pre-primary school children. The study also covered areas for further research.

5.1 Summary of the Findings

The study aimed to determine the influence of parents’ socio-economic factors on enrollment and retention of pre-primary school pupils in Bureti sub-county, Kericho County. The study investigated socio-economic factors such as; parental income, parental education and parental occupation.

5.1.1 Socio-Economic Characteristics of Parents

Results revealed that Parents education level (68.75%), Size of the family (64.06%), parent’s occupation (73.44%) and level of income (71.88%) are among the specific parents’ socio-economic characteristics that affects children enrolment and retention. These imply that educated parents would want to have their children get enrolled and complete school as required.

5.1.2 Level of Education of Parents and Enrolment and Retention

Results revealed that large number of the parents or guardians 29 (45.3%) of dropouts never attended school. There was a strong positive correlation between parental level of education and pre-school children enrolment and retention. This means that a parent who
is highly educated is in better position of offering mentorship to the child as well as acting as a role model in his/her educational journey.

5.1.3 Parents Level of Income and Occupation and Enrolment and Retention

The findings of the study also indicated that 29 (45%) indicated that parents were casual workers showing that their earnings were gotten from casual work which may not be enough to meet all the basic needs leave alone education. The correlation coefficient between parental income and child drop out was strong positively implying that low level of income and the kind of parents’ occupation affects child enrolment negatively. Parents who have better occupation will afford to enroll his/her child and again ensure that he pays for schools throughout the schooling period.

5.1.4 Size of the Family and Enrolment and Retention

Results depicted that 45.31% (29) had between 2-4 members implying that most families in Bureti sub-county have between 2-4 members which are relatively not a big number. The correlation coefficient between family size and child drop out is \( r = +0.512 \) implying that there is a strong positive correlation between family size and child drop out. Big family or small family therefore may influence child drop out from pre-primary schools.

5.1.5 Strategies to Improve Enrolment and Retention

Finally, the study sought to establish strategies that can be employed to improve enrolment and retention of children in pre-primary school in Bureti sub-county. The findings revealed that parent involvement through parent-teacher discussion is one of the strategies to improve child enrolment and retention. Other responses were sponsorships for orphans (88%), Rewarding good performers (81%), provision of teaching and
learning resources (77.3%) and implementation of feeding programme (75.5%), among others. This therefore implies that parents should be involved right from enrolment and throughout pre-school period. This suggests that any factor that may contribute to dropout may be discussed and handled at early stage by the parents and teachers.

### 5.2 Conclusion

It is important to note that retention is an institutional measure used to evaluate the effectiveness of a given school. When a pupil transfers to another institution, this affects the completion rate of the initial school where she is counted as a dropout. When pupils drop out of school, it represents a loss to the society in terms of human capital and potential productive labor. The pupils who dropped out of the schools in the study area did so due to parental socioeconomic characteristics, including parent’s level of education, level of income, parents’ occupation and size of their family.

Pre-school children may be positively influenced by the parental level of education in that the parents don’t bother their children enrolling in school and for the children who have been enrolled whose parent’s educational level is low may lead his/her own son or daughter to drop out of school for he or she may not be a good role model to be emulated by the son. It can be concluded therefore that parental level of education is a determiner of enrollment and retention of pre-school children as indicated by the very strong positive correlation between variables.

In conclusion regarding occupation and level of income, this study revealed that lack of resources and income opportunities among parents is limiting their capacity of educating their sons and daughters, hence drop out from school.
Results on the size of the family regarding child enrolment and retention indicated that a big family influences dropout of child from pre-primary school in that having a big family size may lead to children drop out of school especially if the family income is low. From the findings, it was concluded that children from Bureti sub-county dropped out of school especially those from big families due to inadequate resources for the large number of children in school.

Schools can improve on their retention rates by more accurately determining when and why pupils withdraw from school. Among the identify strategies in the study area were parent involvement in child schooling, sponsoring of children who are not able and maybe be orphans and also rewarding pupils in school.

5.3 Recommendations

The following are the recommendations based on the findings and conclusions of this study:

i) The parents should be encouraged to come up with new strategies of increasing their earnings so as to increase their income and be able to pay fees for their sons. This can be communicated during parents meetings in the school. To increase their income they can be trained on practicing alternative farming.

ii) The parents should be made aware of the importance of child education through compulsory education meetings in school. This will help both parents and teachers to discuss factors which may contribute to child drop and handle them at early stage. Teachers should always engage the parents of the pupils
to ensure the pupils get the basic needs. Teachers should be keen to know all their pupils and understand their back grounds.

iii) Regarding strategies to improve enrollment and retention, there should be incentives like school feeding program for the vulnerable children, sponsorship to buy uniforms and pay other school levies. The pupils could also be assured of sponsorship to higher level of primary.

5.4 Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings of the study the researcher suggests the following for further research.

i) Other socio-economic factors besides family size, parental level of education and parental income should be studied to check if they have influence on child enrolment and retention in pre-primary schools.

ii) A study on pupil-teacher relationship influence on child enrolment and retention in pre-primary schools.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Kenyatta University
School of Education
Department of Early Childhood Studies
P.O. Box 34844 – 00100,
Nairobi.
Date: 27/09/2015.
The Sub-County Education Officer,
P.O Box 1 - 20204
Litein.
Dear Sir/Madam
RE: REQUEST FOR COLLECTION OF RESEARCH DATA
The researcher is an enrolled Masters student at the Kenyatta University and is undertaking a research study as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the Master degree of Kenyatta University. The study title “Influence of Parents’ Socio-economic status on Enrolment and Retention Among Pre-Primary School Pupils in Kericho County, Kenya”.
Your cooperation will be highly appreciated.
Yours Sincerely,

Ketgeronye Vivian C.
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRE-SCHOOL TEACHERS

INSTRUCTIONS:

The researcher is a Masters student at the Kenyatta University and is undertaking a thesis study as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of master of education at Kenyatta University. I am expected to undertake a thesis study. The study tries to examine “Parents’ Socio-Economic Factors’ Influence on Enrolment and Retention of Pre-Primary School Pupils in Bureti Sub-county, Kericho County, Kenya”. I am hereby kindly requesting you to give your honest response to the questionnaire. You are assured that your identity will be treated confidentially. Your response will be accepted as there is no wrong or right answer. Your participation in this study will be highly appreciated.

DO NOT write/indicate your name/particulars in the questionnaire.

Please check/tick (√) against the appropriate answer at the end of every item as required.

Section A: Demographic Information:

1. Kindly indicate your gender
   Male [ ]  Female [ ]

2. How old are you?
   15-24 years [ ]  25-34 years [ ]  35-49 years [ ]  50-65 years [ ]

3. What is your highest academic qualification?
   Ordinary Level [ ]  Advanced Level [ ]  KCPE/ECE [ ]  KJSE/KCSE [ ]

4. Kindly indicate your highest professional qualification

67
P1-certificate [ ] Certificate in ECDE [ ] Diploma in ECDE [ ] BED [ ]

5. How long have you taught in your current station?
   0 -5 years [ ]  6-10 years [ ]  11-15 years [ ]  16-20 years [ ]

Section B: Socio economic factors influencing enrolment and retention of ECDE

6. What is the current enrolment of ECDE children in your school?
   Boys ................
   Girls ................
   Total ................

7. Has the enrolment levels in your pre-school been consistent since you started teaching in this pre-school?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

8. What do you think is the major cause of the current enrolment level?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9. Which curriculum models do you use in teaching?
   a) Ministry of Education model
   b) Kindergarten Heads Association model __________________________
   c) Montessori model __________________________
   d) Any other (state) __________________________

10. Name at least 5 pre-schools that are neighboring to your school and estimate their distance from your school in kilometers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-school Name</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 (a) Are children faced with any security risk as they come to school?  
Yes [ ] No [ ]
(b) If yes, state some of the risks ________________________________

12. How are you paid by the school?  
Promptly [ ] Irregularity [ ] In arrears [ ]

13. What measures do you think can help increase the pre-school enrolment level?  
_________________________________________________________________

14. Are there children of school going age in your school neighborhood who do not go to school?  
Yes [ ] No [ ]

15. If yes, what do you think are the reasons?  
(a) Inadequate pre-schools
(b) Poor quality of schooling
(c) Lack of resources
(d) Others (state) ________________________________
16. Do you think parents’ socio-economic characteristics (such as level of education, level of income, etc.) affect enrollment and retention of preschool children in your school?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

17. If yes, which specific parents’ socio-economic characteristics (tick appropriately)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s level of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of the Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 a) Have your/or children you know benefitted from going through the ECDE rather than joining standard one straight from home?

Yes [ ]

b) If yes state some benefits__________________________

19. What do children who do not attend school do at home?

(a) Baby sitting

(b) Grazing animals

(c) House work

(d) Other (state) __________________________

20. What is the level of education of most of the parents whose children are enrolled in your school?
21. Does the education level of parents’ affect access to early childhood education of their children?

(a) Yes  (b) No

22. What is the average education level of parents whose children do not access early childhood education in your community?

(a) Non formal education  (b) Primary level  (c) Secondary level  (d) Diploma level  (e) University level

23. In your opinion how do you agree with the following statements regarding the influence of level of education on pupil’s enrollment and retention?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uneducated parents don’t educate their sons &amp; daughters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of uneducated parents don’t complete pre-school education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most drop outs come from homes whose parents have not gone to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uneducated parents encourage their sons to go to school as a way of compensation for their parents’ education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most parents never attended school, hence do not bother with their children attending school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents encourage their children to work hard since they themselves have succeeded due to their higher level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Does your school benefit from community support grant?

(a) Yes  (b) No

25. On the average, how do you rate the majority of parents in your pre-school?
26. Kindly indicate parents’ occupation

Salaried [ ] farmer [ ] casual [ ] self-employed [ ]

27. How much do you think the parent earn (pm)? ________________

28. In your opinion, how does the parental income affects child enrollment and retention in pre-primary school in relation to the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High parental income influence the enrolment and retention of pupils in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils who drop out of school come from homes where parents have little income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils from well up families have little chances of dropping out of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils whose parents are stable financially drop out of school because they don’t see the need of education since they are provided with all basic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Does the education level of parents affect access of early childhood education of their children?

(a) Yes                (b) No

Explain your answer..................................................................................................................................................

30. Do you agree with the following strategies of improving enrolment and retention in primary schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of school feeding programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The implementation of Children’s Act 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of Early Childhood Development Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of child friendly schools and inclusive education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. What other measures do you think can help increase the pre-school enrolment levels? 

...........................................
Appendix III: Trend of Enrolment and Retention in Pre-Primary School Pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR:</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL/TERM:</td>
<td>TERM ONE</td>
<td>TERM THREE</td>
<td>TERM ONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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